UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/892,641	06/28/2001	Norihiro Suzuki	35.C15495	4500

5514 7590 01/14/2004

FITZPATRICK CELLA HARPER & SCINTO
30 ROCKEFELLER PLAZA
NEW YORK, NY 10112

EXAMINER	
RAMSEY, KENNETH J	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2879	

DATE MAILED: 01/14/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/892,641	SUZUKI ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Kenneth J. Ramsey	2879	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _____ .

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) 1-3 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) 1 is/are rejected.

7)☒ Claim(s) 2 and 3 is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

11)☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a)☐ approved b)☐ disapproved by the Examiner.

If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.

12)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

13)☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☒ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____ .

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

14)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).

a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

15)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ .
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: .

Rejection

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over JP 7-105,850 in view of Murata et al (4,69,575) and Piascinski et al (5,595,520). JP 7-105,850 teaches the process of applying an electric field to a display device to loosen particles that contaminate the display to remove them. The Japanese patent application differs from the claimed invention in that it is not taught to apply an electric field between the rear plate and face plate in the state that the airtight container is slanted such that a longitudinal direction of the plate shaped spacers is not perpendicular to a direction of gravity. However, it is known from Murata et al to provide plate like spacers to separate the electrodes in such a display. It would have been prima facie obvious to include spacers in the display device of JP 7-105,850 since the spacers allow for a lighter and thus cheaper display while still retaining sufficient strength to withstand the atmospheric pressure on the display panel and therefore are commonly used. It remains a question as to whether or not it would have been obvious to slant the display of JP 7-105,850 in such a manner that the removal of the particles from the display is assisted by the force of gravity. However, to orient the display in such a manner that gravity assists in the removal of the particles from the display would have been an obvious expedient as shown by Piascinski et al, column 3, lines 36-42. Therefore the invention of claim 1

would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art since the spacers if disposed perpendicular to the force of gravity would impede the removal of the particles.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 2 and 3 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

The following is an examiner's statement of reasons for indicating allowable subject matter: Claims 2-3 are allowed since although it was known from JP 7-105,850 to use electric pulse energy fields to shake foreign matter loose from the substrates of an image display device after assembly, the prior art does not teach or suggest the process of manufacturing a image display device comprising disposing a rear plate comprising a plurality of electron emitting devices and a face plate having a phosphor and an electroconductive film opposite to each other with a plurality of plate shaped spacers in between to assemble an airtight container; and applying an electric field between the rear plate and face plate in the state that the airtight container is slanted such that a longitudinal direction of the plate shaped spacers is not perpendicular to a direction of gravity, wherein the electric field is lower than an electric field applied during operation of the device.

Response to Arguments

In response to applicant's arguments against the references individually, one cannot show nonobviousness by attacking references individually where the rejections are based on combinations of references. See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208

USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981); *In re Merck & Co.*, 800 F.2d 1091, 231 USPQ 375 (Fed. Cir. 1986).

In response to applicant's argument that the examiner's conclusion of obviousness is based upon improper hindsight reasoning, it must be recognized that any judgment on obviousness is in a sense necessarily a reconstruction based upon hindsight reasoning. But so long as it takes into account only knowledge which was within the level of ordinary skill at the time the claimed invention was made, and does not include knowledge gleaned only from the applicant's disclosure, such a reconstruction is proper. See *In re McLaughlin*, 443 F.2d 1392, 170 USPQ 209 (CCPA 1971). The applicant has not shown why one of ordinary skill in the art would have arrived at the conclusion that because Japanese patent 7-105,850 employs electric pulse energy fields rather than a thumper mechanism to shake the particles loose that the teaching of Piascinski of using gravity to assist in the removal of the particles is not combinable with the Japanese patent. More over it would have been clearly apparent to the common man that plate members if disposed perpendicular to gravity would impede any motion of particles thereabove due to the force of gravity and that gravity would assist in the removal of the particles if the plate members and any other surfaces as well as any troughs were slanted to at least within 75 degrees of a vertical plane and that the slanting of the display were such that the evacuation port for the display would be placed substantially at the lowest point of the display to facilitate the removal of particles.

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Directions for Responses

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kenneth J. Ramsey whose telephone number is 308-2324. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F from 9 to 5.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Nimesh Patel, can be reached on (703) 305-4794. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 308-0956.

Kenneth J. Ramsey
Primary Examiner